

REMARKS

The Official Action mailed June 13, 2006 and Advisory Action mailed September 28, 2006, has been received and its contents carefully noted. Filed concurrently herewith is a *Request for One Month Extension of Time*, which extends the shortened statutory period for response to October 13, 2006. Also, filed concurrently herewith is a *Request for Continued Examination*. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that this response is being timely filed.

The Applicant appreciates Examiner Lesperance's time and Supervisory Examiner Hjerpe's time in discussing the Applicant's request for correction of the Pre-Grant Publication of the present application, which is U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0095304, on September 25, and October 6, 2006. During the interview the Applicant's representative explained that the abstract, drawings, specification and original claims published in the '304 publication do not correspond with the abstract, drawings, specification and original claims of the present application. Supervisory Examiner Hjerpe agreed that the error was apparently the result of a Patent Office printing error, agreed to determine the proper procedure for correcting the '304 publication, and agreed to contact the Applicant's representative in due course.

Subsequent to the telephone conversation, the Applicant's representative has determined that, when creating the '304 publication, the Patent Office apparently improperly substituted the abstract, drawings, specification and original claims from application Serial No. 09/294,339 for the abstract, drawings, specification and original claims of the present application. Appropriate correction is respectfully requested.

The Applicant notes with appreciation the consideration of the Information Disclosure Statements filed on September 29, 2003; October 16, 2003; and January 12, 2006.

A further Information Disclosure Statement was submitted June 16, 2006 (received by OIPE June 19, 2006), and consideration of this Information Disclosure Statement is respectfully requested.

A further Information Disclosure Statement was submitted September 13, 2006 (received by OIPE September 18, 2006), and consideration of this Information Disclosure Statement is respectfully requested.

A further Information Disclosure Statement is submitted herewith and consideration of this Information Disclosure Statement is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-19 are pending in the present application, of which claims 1-5, 8 and 11 are independent. The Applicant notes with appreciation the allowance of claims 11, 12 and 19 and the indication of the allowability of claims 13-18 (page 12, Official Action mailed June 13, 2006). Independent claims 1-5 and 8 have been amended to include allowable subject matter. Dependent claims 13-18 have been amended to better recite the features of the present invention. For the reasons set forth in detail below, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The Advisory Action maintains the rejection at paragraph 3 of the Official Action mailed June 13, 2006, which rejects claims 1-4 as obvious based on the combination of U.S. Patent No. 5,847,688 to Ohi and U.S. Patent No. 5,049,998 to Lee. The Applicant respectfully submits that a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be maintained against the independent claims of the present application, as amended. The Advisory Action maintains the rejection at paragraph 4 of the Official Action mailed June 13, 2005, which rejects claims 5-10 as anticipated by Ohi. The Applicant respectfully submits that an anticipation rejection cannot be maintained against the independent claims of the present application, as amended.

As stated in MPEP § 2131, to establish an anticipation rejection, each and every element as set forth in the claim must be described either expressly or inherently in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

As stated in MPEP §§ 2142-2143.01, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available

to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either explicitly or implicitly in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. "The test for an implicit showing is what the combined teachings, knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, and the nature of the problem to be solved as a whole would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art." In re Kotzab, 217 F.3d 1365, 1370, 55 USPQ2d 1313, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000). See also In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

The prior art, either alone or in combination, does not teach, either explicitly or inherently, or suggest all the features of the independent claims, as amended. It is noted that, prior to the present *Amendment*, dependent claims 13-18 were "objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims" (page 12, Official Action mailed June 13, 2006). That is, claims 13-18 contained allowable subject matter. Claims 13-18 recited that "said one source driver circuit comprises two shift registers." Independent claims 1-5 and 8 have been amended to recite a first shift register in the source driver circuit and a second shift register in the source driver circuit. Therefore, claims 1-5 and 8, as amended, are believed to recite allowable subject matter.

Specifically, independent claims 1-4 have been amended to recite applying one of the pair of video signals to an odd signal line of the signal lines of a pixel region in accordance with a signal from a first shift register included in the source driver circuit; and applying the other of the pair of video signals to an even signal line of the signal lines of

the pixel region in accordance with a signal from a second shift register included in the source driver circuit. Independent claims 5 and 8 have been amended to recite applying the first video signal to an odd signal line of the signal lines of a pixel region in accordance with a signal from a first shift register included in the source driver circuit; and applying the second video signal to an even signal line of the signal lines of the pixel region in accordance with a signal from a second shift register included in the source driver circuit. These features are supported in the present specification, for example, by Figures 1, 2A and 13.


Further, dependent claims 13-18 have been amended to recite that a first start pulse signal and a first clock signal are inputted to the first shift register, and that a second start pulse signal and a second clock signal are inputted to the second shift register. These features are supported in the present specification, for example, by page 19, lines 16-23, and Figures 1, 2A and 13.

Ohi and Lee do not teach, either explicitly or inherently, or suggest the above-referenced features of the present invention.

Since Ohi and Lee do not teach, either explicitly or inherently, or suggest the above-referenced features of the present invention, an anticipation rejection cannot be maintained. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 are in order and respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Eric J. Robinson
Reg. No. 38,285

Robinson Intellectual Property Law Office, P.C.
PMB 955
21010 Southbank Street
Potomac Falls, Virginia 20165
(571) 434-6789